Remarks

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure in the specification due to an informality on page 11. The specification has been amended to correct this informality and is now believed to be correct and acceptable. Additionally, typographical errors have been corrected on pages 13 and 14.

The Examiner has objected to the numbering of the claims based on the inadvertent misnumbering of two claim 52's. The amended claims provided herein reflect the correct numbering as renumbered by the Examiner.

The Examiner has objected to claims 1, 18 and 35 based on redundant limitations. These claims have been amended to eliminate such redundant limitation in addition to amendments for clarification of the invention as discussed subsequently herein.

The Examiner has objected to claims 8, 25 and 42 as indefinite based on a conflicting limitation with the base claim. These claims have been amended as independent claims to eliminate the conflicting limitation and correctly characterize the intended features of an alternative embodiment of the invention.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-16, 18-33, 35-50 and 52-53 as unpatentable based on Son et al. in view of Graber et al. and DeFreese et al. The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection based on the current amendments to the claims. Son et al., Graber et al. and DeFreese et al. do not disclose or suggest, individually or as combined by the Examiner, the claimed combination of elements comprising the present invention.

The present invention provides flexibility in communication and scaling, not present in the prior art, through the use of a content creator subsystem and a media streaming subsystem each comprised of a plurality of individual units. Interconnection of the units in each of the subsystems to other subsystems uses switches to allow flexible communication between various ones of the units. For example, communication between the individual media creation units and the media streaming subsystem and the individual media steaming engines, the storage subsystem and one of multiple users, enhances the media through put through parallel paths, as shown in FIGs. 2 and 3 and described in the text of the specification at page 10, lines 21 – 29 and lines 11-15 respectively. This architecture allows each of the subsystems to by scaled according to data volume, user

volume and other system variables by selecting the number of media creation units present in the media creator subsystem and, separately, the number of individual media streaming engines in the media streaming subsystem.

This structure and capability is not disclosed in the prior art. Son et al., for instance, discloses multiple "local head-end" and "remote head-end" units each requiring its own media creation elements, infrastructure system manager and storage. See FIGs. 1, 2, 4 and 5 and paragraphs 0023 and 0025, 0026 and 0027. Similarly, while DeFreese et al. discloses a gateway for communication by a number of media servers and application servers, see FIG. 1, media/applications provided by these devices require the use of one gateway while content received through alternate media inputs, digital services and analog services in FIG. 1, require separate gateways for communication to the user which is additionally conducted through distribution hubs containing yet additional data channel gateways. Further, the system of DeFreese requires a dedicated cable system (see col. 10, lines 33-55) teaching away from the use of broadband network enabled backbone of the present invention as claimed.

Graber et al., does not disclose a system or elements comparable to the present invention or compatible with the Son or DeFreese systems. Graber discloses a system for use in a command center, communications aircraft or other closed system having multiple video inputs to be viewed by personnel in the center (see paragraph 0004). As described in paragraph 0016 "Each of the terminal controllers is associated with a display terminal and an input device" requiring dedicated duplication of components for each and every added video terminal. The applicants respectfully contend that the dedicated hardware nature of both DeFreese and Graber teach away from any combination with Son and no valid suggestion in any of the references exists for such combination.

Claims 1, 18 and 35 as well as claims 8, 25, 42, 52 and 53 have been amended to more clearly distinguish the present invention over the prior art. The applicants respectfully contend that these claims as amended demonstrate the novel and non-obvious combination which constitutes the present invention as described in the specification and are patentable over the cited art as argued above.

With respect to claims 2-7 and 9-17, as dependent on claim 1, claims 19-24 and 26-34 as dependent on claim 18, and claims 36-41 and 43-51 as dependent on claim 35,

while Son, Graber and DeFreese disclose certain features or limitations of the claims which have been aggregated by the Examiner in his rejections, the applicants respectfully contend that the invention as a whole as defined by each of the dependent claims is not disclosed or fairly suggested by the prior art based on the argument presented above and the amendments to the independent claims. Claims 11, 28 and 45 have been amended for consistency with the amendments to the claims from which they depend.

It is believed that all claims pending in the application as currently amended are in condition for allowance and action by the Examiner in that regard is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Felix L. Fischer
1607 Mission Drive, Suite 204
Solvang, California 93463
Phone: 805-693-0685
Fax: 805-693-0735

Dated: 06/07/2004